

## REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-4, 6-26, and 28 are currently pending, and
- Claims 1, 7-11, 13, 15-26, and 28 are amended herein.

[0003] Support for the amendments to claims 1, 21, and 25 is found at least in Figure 3 and in the parts of the specification describing Figure 3. Support for the amendments to claims 7, 16, 19, 24, and 28 is found at least in paragraph 44 of the specification. Support for the amendments to claims 10 and 20 is found at least in paragraph 45 of the specification. Support for the amendment to claim 11 is found at least in Figure 5 and in the parts of the specification describing Figure 5. Support for the amendments to claims 15, 18, and 23 is found at least in paragraph 37 of the specification. Claims 8, 9, 22, and 26 are amended merely to improve the readability of the claim. None of the amendments herein introduce new matter.

## Cited Documents

[0004] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Alexander:** Ronald Alexander, U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931
- **Lemmons:** Thomas R. Lemmons et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,266,814
- **Kamen:** Yakov Kamen et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,503,003

Claims 1-4, 6-26, and 28 Are Non-Obvious Over Alexander in view of Lemmons, in further view of Kaman

[0005] Claims 1-4, 6-26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Alexander in view of Lemmons, in further view of Kaman. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0006] Applicant respectfully submits that the cited documents do not teach or suggest the recitations of claim 1. Specifically, the cited documents do not teach or suggest at least the claimed (with emphasis added):

*...in response to one or more triggering user interactions,* presenting a quick EPG-navigation UI that is laid within the grid pattern of the schedule of multimedia programming, the EPG-navigation UI having one or more user-selectable options therein,

*wherein the triggering user interactions include a pre-determined number of presses of the scroll forward key or a number of presses of the scroll forward key which advances a presentation of a schedule of programming in the grid of the EPG UI a predefined amount of time into the future...*

[0007] In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cites col. 9, lines 19-21 of Lemmons as describing, "in response to one or more triggering user interactions, presenting a quick EPG-navigation UI." That passage describes displaying a "quickmenu" at the bottom of channel guide in response to a user pressing a guide key. The Examiner further cites col. 10, lines 36-42 of Alexander as describing, "wherein the triggering user interactions include a pre-determined number of presses of the scroll forward key or a number of

presses of the scroll forward key which advances a presentation of a schedule of programming in the grid of the EPG UI a predefined amount of time into the future.” That passage describes the ability of a user to see later programming by scrolling towards that later programming.

**[0008]** Applicant respectfully submits, in response, that the scrolling forward discussed by Alexander is not a triggering interaction. The user can continue to scroll forward and that scrolling will not trigger the presentation of a “quick EPG-navigation UI.” Rather, the scrolling forward will only accomplish what scrolling forward is well known to accomplish: the display of future programming.

**[0009]** Even when the scrolling of Alexander is combined with the pressing of the guide key of Lemmons, the resulting combination does not teach or suggest “presenting a quick EPG-navigation UI” in response to triggering user interactions that “include a pre-determined number of presses of the scroll forward key or a number of presses of the scroll forward key which advances a presentation of a schedule of programming in the grid of the EPG UI a predefined amount of time into the future.” Explicit in claim 1 is that the pressing of the scroll forward key does two things: advancing presentation of a schedule of programming and triggering the presentation of a quick EPG-navigation UI. The pressing of the guide key and the scrolling described in the cited documents, in contrast, each do only one thing. Thus, neither document teaches or suggests this claimed feature. Furthermore, a system resulting from the combination of Alexander and Lemmons also does not teach or suggest the claimed feature. A system resulting from the combination of Alexander and Lemmons would include two buttons (e.g., a scroll forward button and a guide button). When a user selects the scroll forward

button, the displayed guide will scroll forward. When a user selects the guide button, a “quick menu” will be displayed at the bottom of the screen. Nothing in the combination of Alexander and Lemmons suggests the functionality recited in claim 1.

**[0010]** Consequently, the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

*Independent Claims 13 and 17*

**[0011]** Claims 13 and 17 are also patentable over the cited references at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1.

*Independent Claim 21*

**[0012]** In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is moot. Specifically, the cited references do not teach or suggest at least the claimed (with emphasis added):

...present an inlaid quick EPG-navigation UI in response to one or more triggering user interactions received by the input unit, ***the inlaid quick EPG-navigation UI being inlaid within the grid pattern of the schedule of multimedia programming and having two display areas each including user-selectable options therein, the two display areas including a first display area for finding shows by name or keyword and a second area for finding shows by time***, and the schedule of multimedia programming and inlaid quick EPG-navigation UI both being presented simultaneously...

**[0013]** In rejecting claim 21, the Examiner points to the quickmenu 116 of Lemmons as disclosing a “quick EPG-navigation UI”. As shown in Figure 3 of Lemmons and described in col. 9, lines 19, through col. 10, line 7, the quickmenu includes a row of three displayed menu options. The user can navigate between these and menu options in an endless loop fashion. Menu options include “Hot Picks,” “What’s On,” “Prime Time,” “Program Guide,” “Program Search,” “Day to View,” and “Favorite Channel.”

**[0014]** Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the quickmenu does not teach or suggest an EPG-navigation UI that “[has] two display areas ... the two display areas including a first display area for finding shows by name or keyword and a second area for finding shows by time.” Instead, Lemmons discloses a single display area in the form of a one dimensional row where each option is interchangeable with any other option. The row has no segregation of menu options into display areas, such as a “first display area for finding shows by name or keyword” and a “second area for finding shows by time.”

**[0015]** Applicant has also examined the other portions of the cited references and can find no teaching or suggestion of an “the EPG-navigation UI having two display areas ... the two display areas including a first display area for finding shows by name or keyword and a second area for finding shows by time.”

**[0016]** Also, Applicant notes that the new recitations of claim 21 have not been presented in any previous version of the claims and have not been rejected by the Examiner. Thus, the addition of these recitations is alone sufficient to overcome the rejection of claim 21.

**[0017]** Consequently, the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

*Independent Claim 25*

**[0018]** Claim 25 is also patentable over the cited references at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 21.

*Dependent Claims 2-4, 6-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, 26, and 28*

**[0019]** Claims 2-4, 6-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, 26, and 28 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 13, 17, 21, and 25. As discussed above, claims 1, 13, 17, 21, and 25 are patentable over the cited documents of record. Therefore, claims 2-4, 6-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, 26, and 28 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

**[0020]** For example, claims 7, 16, 18, 24 and 28 have been amended to recite that "the user-selectable options include: an option to search future programming based upon one or more characteristics of that programming; an option to look ahead into the schedule of multimedia programming of the EPG UI; an option to view one or more live television multimedia programs; an option to view one or more on-demand multimedia programs; an option to view one or more pay-per-view multimedia programs; an option to view one or more locally stored multimedia programs; an option to view one or more pay-per-view multimedia programs; an option to view one or more multimedia

commercial messages; and an option to filter or otherwise adjust the parameters the determine which programs are listed by time within the grid.” In rejecting previous versions of these claims, the Examiner cited col. 11, lines 35-36 of Alexander which, according to the Examiner, teach that “the viewer is also given the option of filtering.” Even if the Examiner is correct in characterizing the cited portion of Alexander, claims 7, 16, 19, 24, and 28 now require more than simply an option for filtering.

[0021] Also, claims 10 and 20 have been amended to recite: “receiving a scroll forward input after the presenting of the EPG-navigation UI and, in response, presenting the EPG without the EPG-navigation UI.” These new recitations of claims 10 and 20 have not been presented in any previous version of the claims and have not been rejected by the Examiner. Thus, the addition of these recitations is alone sufficient to overcome the rejections of claims 10 and 20.

[0022] Additionally, claim 11 has been amended to recites that *“the quick EPG-navigation UI is presented so that* it is inlaid between time blocks of the schedule of multimedia programming in the grid pattern and so that *it is shown as being associated with a channel”* (emphasis added). In rejecting claim 11, the Examiner points to Figure 7 of Alexander which, according to the Examiner, shows a “quick navigation table.” In response, Applicant notes that even if Figure 7 does show a “quick navigation table,” that table is not shown as being “inlaid between time blocks of the schedule of multimedia programming in the grid pattern”, as required by claim 11. Also, claim 11 now requires that the EPG-navigation UI be “shown as being associated with a channel.” Neither Figure 7 of Alexander nor any other portion of any of the cited references shows such an EPG-navigation UI.

**[0023]** Further, claims 15 and 23 have been amended to recite that “the triggering user interactions also include a press of a scroll backward key indicating a desire to browse backwards in time.” These new recitations of claims 15, 18, and 23 have not been presented in any previous version of the claims and have not been rejected by the Examiner. Thus, the addition of these recitations is alone sufficient to overcome the rejections of claims 15, 18, and 23.

## Conclusion

[0024] For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

[0025] If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/

Dated: 03/02/2010

Robert C. Peck  
(robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)  
Registration No. 56826

Kayla D. Brant  
(kayla@leehayes.com; 509-944-4742)  
Registration No. 46576